



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,052	03/12/2001	Satoshi Ejima	032376.02	7729
7590 04/25/2005				
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 19928 Alexandria, VA 22320		EXAMINER ONUAKU, CHRISTOPHER O		
		ART UNIT 2616		
		PAPER NUMBER		
DATE MAILED: 04/25/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/803,052

Applicant(s)

EJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher O. Onuaku

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 18 and 19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12&15-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/24/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 1, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 1 of this application including an information processing apparatus, comprising information receiving means for receiving first and second types of information, conversion means for digitizing said first and second types of information, annexing (adding) means for annexing header information to said first and second types of digitized information, with said header information comprising said times, recording

Art Unit: 2616

means for recording said digitized information with said annexed header information, and reproduction means for reproducing said recorded information (see lines 1-20).

The invention defined by claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 1 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 1 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 1 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 1 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 2, claim 2 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 2 of this application including wherein said annexing means includes means for annexing the same header information that is already annexed to said first type of information, during reproduction of said first type of information, to said second type of information while recording said second type of information (see lines 1-7).

The invention defined by claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 2 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 2 of current application is obvious over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 2 of current application is broader than claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 2 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously

Art Unit: 2616

granted for the invention defined by patent claim 2, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 3, claim 3 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 3 of this application including wherein said annexing means includes means for replacing header information that is already annexed to said first type of information with the same header information that is annexed to said second type of information (see lines 1-6).

The invention defined by claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 3 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 3 of current application is obvious over claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 3 of current application is broader than claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 3 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 3, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 4, claim 4 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 4 of this application including a first modification means for modifying a rate of

Art Unit: 2616

speed at which said information receiving means receives said first type of information, and second modification means for modifying a time interval during which said information receiving means receives said second type of information in proportion to the results of said modifying of said modification means (see lines 1-9)..

The invention defined by claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 4 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 4 of current application is obvious over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 4 of current application is broader than claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 4 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 4, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 5, claim 5 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 5 of this application including wherein said first type of information comprises photographic images and said second type of information comprises sounds and said second modification means modifies said time interval to  $1/N$  seconds when said first modification means has modified said rate of speed to  $N$  photographic frames per second (see lines 1-8).

The invention defined by claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 5 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 5 of current

Art Unit: 2616

application is obvious over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 5 of current application is broader than claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 5 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 5, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 6, claim 6 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 6 of this application including an information processing apparatus, comprising a photographic lens, a microphone, a photoelectric device, said photoelectric device being connected to said photographic lens for receiving images from said photographic lens and converting said images into electrical signals, an analog/digital conversion device, said analog/digital conversion device being connected to said photoelectric device and said microphone for digitizing analog signals received from said photoelectric device and said microphone, an electronic memory for recording said digitized signals, a microprocessor, said microprocessor being connected to said analog/digital conversion device and having a clock circuit for recording the times when said photographic lens receives said images and said microphone receives sounds, an annexing means for annexing said times as header information to said digitized signals, and reproducing means for retrieving said digitized signals from said electronic memory, a display device

Art Unit: 2616

being connected to said microprocessor, and a speaker being connected to said microprocessor (see lines 1-29).

The invention defined by claim 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 6 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 6 of current application is obvious over claim 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 6 of current application is broader than claim 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 6 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 6, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 7, claim 7 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 7 of this application including a touch tablet for receiving input information by contact with said touch tablet, said touch tablet being connected to said microprocessor and providing digitized signals corresponding to said contact to said microprocessor (see lines 1-6).

The invention defined by claim 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 7 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 7 of current application is obvious over claim 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 7 of current application is broader than claim 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 7 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously



Art Unit: 2616

granted for the invention defined by patent claim 7, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

9. Claim 8 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 8, claim 8 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 8 of this application including a method of processing information with an information processing device having receiving means, conversion means, an electronic memory, and a microprocessor, said microprocessor having a clock circuit, an annexing means and reproduction means, said method including the steps of receiving a first type of information with said information receiving means, converting said first type of information into first digital signals, annexing said first time as first header information to said first digital signals, recording said first digital signals with said first header information on said electronic memory, receiving a second type of information with said information receiving means, converting said second type of information into second digital signals, annexing second header information to said second digital signals and replacing said first header information recorded with the first digital signals with the second header information (see 1-22).

The invention defined by claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 8 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 8 of current application is obvious over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 8 of current application is broader than claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of

Art Unit: 2616

claim 8 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 8, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

10. Claim 9 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 9 of this application including the method wherein said step of receiving a first type of information comprises receiving an image through a photographic lens, said step of converting said first type of information comprises converting said image into first analog electrical signals into first digital signals, said step of reproducing said first digital signals while receiving a second type of information comprises reproducing said first digital signals while receiving sounds with a microphone, said microphone converting said sounds into second analog electrical signals (see lines 1-12).

The invention defined by claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 9 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 9 of current application is obvious over claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 9 of current application is broader than claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 9 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 9, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

Art Unit: 2616

11. Claim 10 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953

Regarding claim 10, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 10 of this application including said first header information is annexed to said first and second digital signals (see lines 6-7).

The invention defined by claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 10 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 10 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 10 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 10 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

12. Claim 11 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953

Regarding claim 11, claim 10 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 11 of this application including the method including receiving a third type of information with said information receiving means, converting said third type of information into third digital signals, annexing third header information to said third digital signals, and recording said third digital signals with said third header information on said electronic memory (see lines 1-9).

The invention defined by claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 11 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 11 of current application is obvious over claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 11 of current application is broader than claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 11 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 11, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

13. Claim 12 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 12, claim 11 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 12 of this application including the method wherein said step of receiving a third type of information comprises receiving two-dimensional data by contact of a writing instrument with a surface on said information processing device, wherein said surface senses the positions assumed by said writing instrument (see lines 1-7).

The invention defined by claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 12 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 12 of current application is obvious over claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 12 of current application is broader than claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 12 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 11, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

Art Unit: 2616

14. Claim 15 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6&16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 15, claims 6&16 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,449,227 cite the features of claim 15 of this application including photographing means for photographing a subject and recording means for recording sound (see lines 1-3 of claim 6), first changing means for changing a number of image frames photographed by the photographing means per unit time and a second changing means for changing a recording time interval during which sound information is recorded by the recording means in proportion to a number of photographed image frames per unit time as changed by the first changing means (see lines 6-12).

The invention defined by claims 6&16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 15 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 15 of current application is obvious over claims 6&16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 15 of current application is broader than claims 6&16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 15 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claims 6&16, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

15. Claim 16 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6&16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 16, claims 6&16 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,449,227 cite the features of claim 16 of this application including photograph and record sound

Art Unit: 2616

information (see lines 1-3 of claim 6), change the number of photographed image frames per unit time and change a recording time interval during which sound information is recorded in proportion to the changed number of photographed image frames per unit time (see lines 6-12).

The invention defined by claims 6&16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 16 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 16 of current application is obvious over claims 6&16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 16 of current application is broader than claims 6&16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of claim 16 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claims 6&16, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

16. Claim 17 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953.

Regarding claim 17, claim 5 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 cite the features of claim 5 of this application including wherein the control program changes the recording time interval during which sound information is recorded to  $1/N$  second, when the number of photographed image frames per second is  $N$  (see lines 1-8).

The invention defined by claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 is drawn to the same invention as claim 17 of this current application. Furthermore, claim 17 of current application is obvious over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953 because claim 17 of current application is broader than claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,953. Allowance of

Art Unit: 2616

claim 17 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 5, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

17. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

18. Claims 15&16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamagishi et al (US 6,084,630).

Regarding claim 15, Yamagishi et al disclose a recording apparatus for recording information such as a still picture or voice on a recording medium such as a semiconductor memory, comprising:

a) photographing means for photographing a subject (see Fig.1A; taking lens 10, shutter 12, and image pickup 14; col.3, lines 15-30);

b) recording means for recording sound (see Fig.1A; microphone 22 and buffer memory 32; col.3, lines 15-45);

Art Unit: 2616

c) "first" changing means for changing a number of image frames photographed by the photographing means per unit time (see Fig.1A; mode switch 66; col.3, line 56 to col.4, line 12); and

c) "second" changing means for changing recording time interval during which sound information is recorded by the recording medium in proportion to a number of photographed image frames per unit time as changed by the first changing means (see Fig.1A, voice mode switch 72; col.3, line 55 to col.4, line 12; and col.5, lines 10-25).

Regarding claim 16, the claimed limitations of claim 16 are accommodated in the discussions of claim 15 above, except for the claimed recording medium (see Fig.1A; memory 56; col.3. lines 45-55).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 1,6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuoka (US 6,614,946) in view of Hashimoto et al (US 5,815,201).

Regarding claim 1, Fukuoka disclose a still camera for coding and decoding image data and voice data with respect to a photographed image and recording and reproducing these data from a recording medium, comprising:



Art Unit: 2616

a) information receiving means for receiving first (see camera circuit 1) and second (see microphone 2) types of information (Fig.1; col.4, lines 45-59);

b) conversion means for digitizing said first and second types of information (see A/D converter 3 and A/D converter 4; col.4, lines 45-50).

Fukuoka fails to explicitly disclose detecting means for detecting the times the first and second types of information are received by said receiving means and annexing means for annexing header information to said first and second types of digitized information, with said header information comprising said times.

Hashimoto teaches in Fig.8 a digital electronic camera which automatically detects a connection to an external processing device comprising a CPU 23 which performs a clock function for recording the date and time of when the audio and video have been captured (see col.7, line 66 to col.8, line 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Fukuoka by realizing the CPU of Fukuoka with a clock circuit in order to record the date and time of when the audio and the video are captured.

With Fukuoka modified with Hashimoto, Fukuoka then discloses recording means for recording said digitized information with said annexed header information (Fukuoka memory card; col.5, lines 1-48); and reproduction means for reproducing said recorded information (see col.6, line 66 to col.7, line 4).

Regarding claim 6, Fukuoka further discloses:

a) a photographic lens (see Fig.5, pickup lens 37; col.6, lines 38-51);

b) a microphone (see Fig.5; microphone 30; col.6, lines 52-59);

c) a photoelectric device, said photoelectric device being connected to said photoelectric lens for receiving images from the photoelectric lens and converting said images into electrical signals (see Fig.5; CCD 39; col.6, lines 38-51);

d) an analog/digital conversion device, said analog/digital conversion device being connected to said photoelectric device and said microphone for digitizing analog signals received from said photoelectric device and said microphone (see Fig.5; A/D converter 34; col.6, lines 52-59);

e) an electronic memory for recording said digitized signals (see Fig.5; memory card 45; lines 38-51).

Fukuoka discloses a microprocessor (see CPU 51 of Fig.5) and display means (see mode display 50 of Fig.5). Fukuoka fails to explicitly disclose a microprocessor having a clock circuit. Hashimoto, in a similar field of endeavor teaches in Fig.8, a digital electronic camera which automatically detects a connection to an external processing device comprising a CPU 23 which performs a clock function for recording the data and time of when the audio and video signals has been captured (see col.7, line 66 to col.8, line 8. It, therefore, would have been obvious to modify Fukuoka by realizing CPU of Fukuoka with a clock circuit in order to record the date and time of when the audio and video signals has been captured, as taught by Hashimoto.

21. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuoka in view of Hashimoto et al, and further in view of Cruz et al (US 5,613,032).

Regarding claim 7, Fukuoka and Hashimoto fail to explicitly disclose a touch tablet for receiving input information by contact with the touch tablet, the touch tablet being connected to the microprocessor and providing digitized signals corresponding to the contact to the microprocessor.

Cruz et al teach a system and method for recording and playing back multimedia events comprising an electronic white board 127 (touch tablet) and the microprocessor 300. The electronic white board records texts and drawings written thereon and outputs a digital stroke list resulting in high visual quality and a low processing and storage requirements. The electronic white board transmits its record to the microprocessor 300 which synchronizes the record in time for storage at the storage 390 (see col.5, lines 43-67; col.10, line 19 to col.11, line 20).

It, therefore, would have been obvious to further modify Fukuoka by realizing the receiving system of Fukuoka with an electronic white board (touch tablet), as taught by Cruz, which outputs texts and drawings high in visual quality and low in processing and storage requirements, and connect the electronic white board to a processor which synchronizes the record in time for storage.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

22. Claims 18&19 are allowable over the prior art of record.
23. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Regarding claim 18, the invention relates to an information input apparatus whereby, when a second type of information has been input in a format added to a first type of information, after having recorded the first type of information with header information including the input date and time of the first type of information, adding of information can be performed easily by recording the second type of information while annexing header information identical to or related to the first type of information.

The closest references Fukuoka (US 5,614,846) discloses a still camera for coding and decoding image data with respect to a photographed image and recording and reproducing these data from a recording medium, and Hashimoto et al (US 5,815,201) teach a digital electronic camera and the interfacing of the camera to an external processing device which monitors, receives images and/or audio, and/or controls the camera through an input/output interface, including a digital electronic camera which automatically detects a connection to an external processing device

However, Fukuoka and Hashimoto et al fail to explicitly disclose an information input apparatus, where the apparatus comprises control means for ensuring that when new information is input by the input means while information recorded by the recording means is being replayed by the replay means, the header information attached to the information being replayed and header information attached to the new information are one of the same and related header information.

Regarding claim 19, the invention relates to an information input apparatus whereby, when a second type of information has been input in a format added to a first

Art Unit: 2616

type of information, after having recorded the first type of information with header information including the input date and time of the first type of information, adding of information can be performed easily by recording the second type of information while annexing header information identical to or related to the first type of information.

The closest references Fukuoka (US 5,614,846) discloses a still camera for coding and decoding image data with respect to a photographed image and recording and reproducing these data from a recording medium, and Hashimoto et al (US 5,815,201) teach a digital electronic camera and the interfacing of the camera to an external processing device which monitors, receives images and/or audio, and/or controls the camera through an input/output interface, including a digital electronic camera which automatically detects a connection to an external processing device

However, Fukuoka and Hashimoto et al fail to explicitly disclose an information input apparatus, where the apparatus comprises control means for ensuring that when new information is input by the input means while information recorded by the recording means is being replayed by the replay means, the header information attached to the information being replayed and header information attached to the new information are one of the same and related header information.

24. Claims 13&14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2616

25. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 13, the invention relates to an information input apparatus whereby, when a second type of information has been input in a format added to a first type of information, after having recorded the first type of information with header information including the input date and time of the first type of information, adding of information can be performed easily by recording the second type of information while annexing header information identical to or related to the first type of information.

The closest references Fukuoka (US 5,614,846) discloses a still camera for coding and decoding image data with respect to a photographed image and recording and reproducing these data from a recording medium, and Hashimoto et al (US 5,815,201) teach a digital electronic camera and the interfacing of the camera to an external processing device which monitors, receives images and/or audio, and/or controls the camera through an input/output interface, including a digital electronic camera which automatically detects a connection to an external processing device

However, Fukuoka and Hashimoto et al fail to explicitly disclose a method of processing information with an information processing device having information receiving means, conversion means for digitizing information received by the information receiving means, an electronic memory, and a microprocessor, the microprocessor having a clock, an annexing means and reproduction means, where the method further includes the step of deleting the first digital signals from the electronic memory with the first digital signals having the first time annexed thereto and deleting

Art Unit: 2616

the second digital signal having the second time annexed thereto when the second time is equal to the first time.

Regarding claim 14, the invention relates to an information input apparatus whereby, when a second type of information has been input in a format added to a first type of information, after having recorded the first type of information with header information including the input date and time of the first type of information, adding of information can be performed easily by recording the second type of information while annexing header information identical to or related to the first type of information.

The closest references Fukuoka (US 5,614,846) discloses a still camera for coding and decoding image data with respect to a photographed image and recording and reproducing these data from a recording medium, and Hashimoto et al (US 5,815,201) teach a digital electronic camera and the interfacing of the camera to an external processing device which monitors, receives images and/or audio, and/or controls the camera through an input/output interface, including a digital electronic camera which automatically detects a connection to an external processing device

However, Fukuoka and Hashimoto et al fail to explicitly disclose a method where the method further includes the step of deleting one of the first and second digital signals from the electronic memory when the first and second header informations are the same without deleting the other of the first and second digital signals from the electronic memory.

**Conclusion**


26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher O. Onuaku whose telephone number is (703) 308-7555. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on (571) 272-7375. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
COO

4/16/05

  
ANDREW FAILE  
SUPERVISORY EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600